DRAFT #1 – JUNE 29, 2001
NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
June 2001
San Francisco, California

Meeting One: Thursday, June, 2:00 – 5:00 P.M., Moscone Convention Center South,
Rooms 274/276

Present:
Committee Members: Lynn Chmelir, Martha Kyrillidou, Bill Miller, Carolyn Norman,
Leland Park, Stanley Wilder (absent: Susan Anderson)
Ex-officio: Denise Davis (NCLIS), Pat Garner (Census), Julia Glynn (minutes recorder),
Mary Jo Lynch (ALA), Cindy Sheckells (Census), Hugh Thompson (ACRL), Jeff
Williams (NCES)

1. Preliminaries
   a. Introductions
   b. Logistics (Dinner at Dine at 6:30 P.M.)
   c. Midwinter minutes were not included in the Agenda packet but will be sent out
      via e-mail after Conference has ended.
   d. Agenda approved

2. 1998 survey results (Jeff Williams)
   The EDTABS report is awaiting approval from the chief statisticians office. The
   review process should be finished by the end of the month. When approved, the
   report will be put up on the NCES web site.

   Mary Jo suggested that the group read an article from the May 2001 issue of *Journal
   of Academic Libraries* which shows the use of the 1996 IPEDS data. The author plans
   to write another article when the 1998 data becomes available.

   Jeff also noted that NCES has just released *The Status of Academic Libraries in the
   United State: Results from the 1996 Academic Library Survey with Historical
   Comparisons*.

3. Status of peer search program developed for NCES by Sierra Systems (Jeff Williams)
   The tool will be posted by July 1, 2001. It will use 1998 data

4. Status report on 2000 data collection (Pat Garner)
   February 19, 2001 was the close-out date for the data collection, with a final response
   rate of 85%. There were delays in exporting the data off the web but Census is
   currently in the editing stages. They are now in the process of developing looser
   parameters for their edits so that only extreme outliers will be questioned.

A data display tool using 2000 data will be up by August 1, 2001. An access code or an institutional ID will be needed to see data. The committee recommended that 2000 data be available in the peer search tool and in a summary report (EDTABS) by data collection of 2002 data.

5. Other Surveys and Projects that do or could have an impact on IPEDS and ALS

   a. ACRL (Hugh Thompson)
      ACRL gathering of 2000 data ended in late March/early April of 2001. There was a response of over 50%. An e-file will soon be available for purchase and a print copy will be available in mid-August.

      Lynn Chmelir noted that she had heard many complaints about ACRL's decision to use the ARL form (familiar to some 100 libraries) rather than the NCES/ALS forms (familiar to over 3,000 libraries). Martha Kyrillidou explained the history of ACRL's using the ARL form and Mary Jo pointed out that the history was mentioned in her draft article ("Why so many forms?"). The group discussed several aspects of this issue and concluded that it made sense for each line on the form used by ACRL to collect data for academic year 2000-2001 to show the corresponding number from the NCES/ALS form. This would be useful to libraries as a link back to the NCES/ALS 2000 data collection and would be especially helpful in states that use the NCES/ALS form in years when NCES does not collect ALS data. The group agreed to work towards a single form eventually and will consider the "marked-up" ACRL form at Midwinter 2002 with that end in mind.

   b. ARL (Martha Kyrillidou)
      ARL will not be changing their basic statistical survey form.

   c. Oberlin Group (Leland Park)
      There was a good return rate this year and no data elements changed. There was a 6-week survey turn-around for reporting results. Questions about e-books are not yet on the survey but will probably be added this fall.

   d. NCES Library Statistics Program
      Jeff Williams announced that all library surveys will be reviewed this coming year, including the ALS.

6. Review of ALS 2000
   The group discussed several aspects of ALS 2000 and made suggestions for 2002.

   - Timing:
     NCES and Census reported that collective push by the committee and the LRs at the end helped enormously. A suggestion was made that the registration period should be not be separated from the data collection. Both activities should happen at the same time.

- Communication
    - Chief Academic Officer: Send first announcement as a short memo to the Chief Academic Officer, not to the President of the university or college.
    - Library Director: a follow-up letter should be sent to the library director saying something like, "If you never got this before…"
    - Key Holder: Remind key holders to contact law and medical libraries that are part of the same institution. Also, ALA or NCES should contact law and medical librarian associations to post an announcement of the need to report data to the main campus library.
    - LRs: State libraries and academic libraries usually do not have much contact with each other. Lynn Chmelir suggested that the LRs should be from the academic library community.

- Universe file:
  Non-Title IV schools may need to be removed from the universe file for ALS. Committee wants to study a report on the non-respondents, i.e., a report according to sector showing public and private for each.

- Web site:
  Stanley Wilder reported that it was easy to use. E-mail from Mary Jo to Jeff Williams and Pat Garner (#284) asked that the printout for "Institution Reporting Status" should show the name of the state, the sector, and whether or not the institution is a Title IV or not.

- Edit checks:
  Unisys will make changes to the "must fixes" in the edit checks for the 2002 survey. This will make them less annoying to respondents.

  There should be a choice of when edits can be made during the survey process; (i.e., on a screen by screen basis or at the end of the survey).

Before the committee adjourned, Mary Jo read them the suggestions made at the Midwinter Brainstorming session for consideration before the Friday morning meeting. Those suggestions follow:

a. We should consider adapting the ARL method of dealing with electronic serials and books, i.e., if the way a title is paid for and catalogued is similar to what happens to print books and serials, the electronic title should be reported in a similarly way in the ALS. (Lynn Chmelir agreed to do that for now but suggested that the situation may change sometime soon.)
b. We should NOT ask libraries to count the titles in packages put together by aggregators to which they lease access.
c. If a publisher sells the electronic version and the print version of a title in a package, count the expenditure with other expenditures for electronic resources.

d. We need to find out what resources are made available, at what cost, and who is paying (e.g., local budgets, state library, other).
e. Digital Libraries. Several yes/no questions were suggested: Is the library producing digital documents? Are you involved in digital library projects?
f. Hours open is still important to count.
g. We need to find a way to measure use from outside the building.
h. We need a way to find out if the library is involved in formal assessment of user satisfaction (Martha recommends an article by Bonnie Gratch Lindaur in November 1998 issue of *College and Research Libraries*).
i. We might also ask if the library is included in institutional surveys of alumni and others regarding the institution as a whole.
j. We need to ask about library involvement in Information Literacy (note recent ACRL guidelines).
k. Wireless technology is very problematic and may not warrant a question.
l. We need to consider the connection between shared circulation systems and interlibrary loan statistics.
m. Section 8, "Staff," is probably okay as it is.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
June 2001
San Francisco, California

Meeting Two: Friday, June 15, 9:00 A.M.–12:00 P.M., San Francisco Marriott, Pacific E

Present:
Committee Members: Lynn Chmelir, Martha Kyrillidou, Bill Miller, Carolyn Norman, Leland Park, Stanley Wilder (absent: Susan Anderson)
Ex-officio: Denise Davis (NCLIS), Pat Garner (Census), Julia Glynn (minutes recorder), Mary Jo Lynch (ALA), Cindy Sheckells (Census), Hugh Thompson (ACRL), Jeff Williams (NCES)

7. Review of article on "Why so many forms?"
    The group agreed that the article by Mary Jo Lynch should be revised to incorporate the positive developments discussed Thursday afternoon and published in Fall 2001. Bill Miller gave Mary Jo his copy of the draft suggesting additional changes.

8. Changes for ALA 2002
    The group revisited the 13 suggestions made during the "brainstorming" session at Midwinter. (See end of minutes from Thursday afternoon for full list). The 13 suggestions can be grouped into four categories according to disposition:

    1. Confirm decision to not change NCES/ALS
        b (titles in package of periodicals)
        f (hours open)
        h (wireless technology)
        m (staff)

    2. Drop the idea for now
        g (use from outside the building)
        h (wireless)

    3. Find another way to get data (e.g. NCES sample survey, ACRL Annual Survey)
        h (assessment of user satisfaction)
        i (library in institutional surveys)
        j (library involvement in information literacy)

    4. Make changes in NCES/ALS
        a (ARL method for counting electronic resources)
        c (expenditures for serials both electronic and print)
        d (electronic resources – what and who pays)
        e (digital documents)
        l (shared circulation systems and interlibrary loan)

The group considered what to do about the four change areas listed above and also considered several additional suggestions from Mary Jo regarding: expenditures for electronic resources, the definition of reference transaction, the need to be clearer about reporting government documents only if they are accessible through the library's catalog. It was agreed that Mary Jo will prepare drafts of the following for discussion at Midwinter 2002:

Part C – Library Expenditures:
   Revise definitions for line 13 (electronic one-time purchase) and line 15 (electronic ongoing commitments) by using questions 1 and 2 from ARL Supplementary Questionnaire, 1998-99.

Part D – Library Collections
   Move concept of "accessible through the library's catalog from definition of "volume" to NOTE at beginning of Part D.

   Create a new line for e-books (only if library owns them).

Part F – Service, typical week
   Modify definition of line 38 (circulation) to say that e-book circulation should NOT be counted here unless it cannot be separated from other circulation.

   Modify definition for line 43 to ensure that <u>all</u> reference transactions are counted.

Part G – Electronic Services
   Modify line 48 to bring out the fact that a library is digitizing documents.

   Add a question designed to capture an estimate of the extent to which the costs of electronic resources are covered by a source outside the institution (e.g., state library, grant to a consortia). Provide several categories such as:

   - less than $1,000
   - from $1,000 to $5,000
   - more than $5,000